

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

Claims 12 and 14 are amended. Claims 1-39 are pending.

I. Interview Summary

The Applicants are appreciative of the indication in the interview conducted prior to December 17, 2008 that paragraph 0028 of the present specification may appear to disclose the features of the previously amended claims and that the Examiner would analyze whether paragraph 0028 of the present specification would overcome the § 112 rejection.

In addition, the Applicants are unclear as to why the Examiner indicated that clarifying that a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports, would clarify the present invention with respect to the Carter reference, but still maintained the § 102 rejection.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

In the Office Action at page 2, numbered paragraph 2, claims 1-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The previously amended claims recite, for example, "selectively connecting an audio circuit part co-operable with the selected audio apparatus type from among the plurality of the audio circuit parts and each one of the connection ports, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports." Paragraph 0028 of the present specification recites that "the control part 10 controls the switching part 60 to selectively connect each connection port 52, 54 and 56 to one of the corresponding compatible input, output and line input audio circuit parts 42, 44 and 46. Thus, for example, even though each audio apparatus such as the speaker 82, the microphone 84 or the CD player 86 is connected to the first connection port 52, the sound card 200 is controlled so that each connected audio apparatus is connected to the corresponding compatible audio circuit part 42, 44 or 46. Thus, any of the audio apparatuses can work even though a user connects the audio apparatuses to

any one of the connection ports 52, 54 and 56 independent of the types of the audio apparatuses.”

Therefore, the present specification does explicitly discuss selectively connecting an audio circuit part 42, 44, 46...and each one of the connection ports, a switching unit 60 causing each one of the connection ports 52, 54, 56 to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts 42, 44, 46, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports 52, 54, 56. Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102

In the Office Action, at page 4, numbered paragraph 3, claims 1-9, 12-16, 18, 19 and 21-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,039,205 to Carter et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed because Carter does not discuss or suggest:

selectively connecting an audio circuit part co-operable with the selected audio apparatus type from among the plurality of the audio circuit parts and each one of the connection ports, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports,

as recited in independent claim 1.

Carter does not discuss that each of the ports (near field mic, far field mic, headset, headset, aux input/output, to amp/speakers, normal telephone, conference phone) may be connected to each of audio circuit parts.

As shown in Figs. 3 and 4 of Carter, the near field mic, the far field mic, the headset, the headset, the aux input/output, to amp/speakers, the normal telephone, and the conference phone each have a separate input port. None of the input ports for each of these transducers is able to connect to a different transducer. The input port for the near field microphone only accepts near field microphones. The input port for the headset only accepts headsets. Thus, each of the input ports is specifically tied to the particular apparatus suitable for that input port.

Likewise, as shown in Fig. 1 of the present disclosure, the prior art shows that specific input ports only accept specific transducers. For example, the speaker connection port 142 only accepts speaking devices 180, 182. The microphone connection port 144 only accepts microphones 184. The line input connection port 146 only accepts external sound apparatuses (such as a CD player 186). The connection ports 142, 144, 146 can only accept certain types of transducers. This is the same issue as in Carter. In Carter, the connection ports can only accept certain types of transducers. Specifically, for example, the near field mic port cannot

accept a telephone. Carter would not be able to operate correctly if the near field mic port accepted a telephone.

In contrast, as shown in Fig. 2, for example, the present invention includes multiple connection ports 52, 54, 56. Each of the connection ports 52, 54, 56 can be selectively connected to an audio circuit part 42, 44 or 46, depending on which type of apparatus is connected to the connection port 52, 54 or 56. Thus, every single connection port 52, 54, 56 can accept every type of transducer because every connection port 52, 54, 56 can be connected to the appropriate audio circuit part 42, 44 or 46. The switching part 60 causes each connection port 52, 54, 56 to be able to be connected to each audio circuit part 42, 44, 46.

In Carter, each connection port (near field mic, far field mic, handset, headset, aux input/output, to amp/speakers, normal telephone, conference phone) can not be connected to different audio circuit parts because the normal telephone, for example, would need to be connected to a different audio circuit part than the near field microphone, for example. However, in Carter, the input port for the near field microphone is limited only to the near field microphone. The input port for the normal telephone is limited only to the normal telephone. Carter would not be able to function properly if, for example, the normal telephone was connected to the near field microphone port.

In contrast, as shown in Fig. 2 of the present disclosure, if the microphone 84 is connected to the first connection port 52, the switching part 60 determines that the first connection port 52 should be connected to the input audio circuit part 42. If the speaker 82 is connected to the first connection port 52, the switching part 60 determines that the first connection port 52 should be connected to the output audio circuit part 44. If the CD player 86 is connected to the first connection port 52, the switching part 60 determines that the first connection port 52 should be connected to the line input audio circuit part 46.

Therefore, the present invention of claim 1, for example, permits all of the transducers 80, 82, 84, 86 to be connected to all of the connection ports 52, 54, 56 so that they are operable by connecting the connection ports 52, 54, 56 with the appropriate audio circuit part 42, 44 or 46. Carter does not permit this.

Therefore, as Carter does not discuss or suggest "selectively connecting an audio circuit part co-operable with the selected audio apparatus type from among the plurality of the audio circuit parts and each one of the connection ports, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports," as recited in independent claim 1,

claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Also, Carter does not discuss or suggest “at least two connection ports, an audio apparatus being connected to each of the connection ports; a plurality of audio circuit parts operating according to a type of the audio apparatus; a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports; and a control part controlling selective connection of each of the connection ports to one of the plurality of the audio circuits operable with the audio apparatus type,” as recited in independent claim 5, claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Carter does not discuss or suggest a sound card including “a switching part selectively connecting an audio circuit part co-operable with the type of the audio apparatus from among the plurality of audio circuit parts and each one of the connection ports, the switching part causing each of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the plurality of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to each connection port,” as recited in amended independent claim 12. Carter does not discuss that the connection ports or a switching part are integral to the sound card or that the audio signal processor is integral to the sound card. Therefore, claim 12 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Additionally, Carter does not discuss or suggest a sound card including “an audio signal processor processing input and/or output audio signals from/to the audio apparatuses connected to any one of the connection ports independent of a type of each audio apparatus, the audio signal processor including a plurality of audio circuit parts; and a switching part selectively connecting an audio circuit part co-operable with the type of the audio apparatus from among the plurality of audio circuit parts and each one of the connection ports, the switching part causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the plurality of audio circuit parts, depending on a type of the audio apparatus that is connected to the connection ports,” as recited in amended independent claim 14.

Carter does not discuss that the connection ports are integral to the sound card or that the audio signal processor is integral to the sound card. Therefore, claim 14 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Carter further does not discuss or suggest “controlling the multimedia component to connect the one connection port connected to the detected multimedia apparatus to a compatible information signal processor of the multimedia component according to a multimedia apparatus type selection in the activated multimedia apparatus type selection menu for the one connection port, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports, wherein each of the connection ports is selectively connectable to the information signal processor of the multimedia component compatible with the multimedia apparatus,” as recited in independent claim 18. Therefore, claim 18 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Further, Carter does not discuss or suggest “selectively connecting each of the connection ports to one of a plurality of audio circuit parts co-operable with the external device connected to each of the connection ports, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports” as recited in independent claim 19. Therefore, claim 19 patentably distinguishes over the reference relied upon. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-9, 13, 15 and 21-38 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 1, 5, 12, 14 and 19 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 7 recites “a switching part controlled by the type selection program to selectively connect the plurality of the audio circuit parts and the at least two connection ports to each other.” Therefore, claims 2-4, 6-9, 13, 15 and 21-38 patentably distinguish over the reference relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection is respectfully requested.

II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

In the Office Action, at page 14, numbered paragraph 5, claims 10, 11 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,553 to Fado et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As discussed above, Carter does not discuss or suggest all the features of independent claim 5. Carter also does not discuss or suggest “controlling the multimedia component to connect the at least one connection port to a compatible information signal processor of the

multimedia component according to the selection, a switching unit causing each one of the connection ports to be able to be connected to each one of the audio circuit parts, depending on the audio apparatus type connected to the connection ports, wherein each of the connection ports is selectively connectable to the information signal processor of the multimedia component compatible with the multimedia apparatus type," as recited in independent claim 16. Fado fails to make up for the deficiencies in Carter. Therefore, claims 5 and 16 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon.

Claims 10, 11 and 17 depend either directly or indirectly from one of independent claims 5 and 16 and include all the features of their respective independent claims, plus additional features that are not discussed or suggested by the references relied upon. For example, claim 10 recites that "in the user selection window is a connection port display window to display whether the audio apparatus is connected to a corresponding connection port via each displayed connection port." Therefore, claims 10, 11 and 17 patentably distinguish over the references relied upon for at least the reasons noted above. Accordingly, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, at page 16, numbered paragraph 6, claims 20 and 39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carter and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0041189 to Choi et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A verified English translation of Korean Application No. 2002- 72845, filed November 21, 2002, is submitted herewith, thereby perfecting priority to the filing date of November 21, 2002. The perfected priority date of November 21, 2002 would only qualify Choi as prior art under one of 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), (f) or (g). Additionally, the invention of Choi and the present application were both subject to an obligation of assignment to Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. at the time the invention was made the Therefore, in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), Choi should be removed as a prior art reference for the §103(a) rejection.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 1-39 are pending and under consideration.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 10, 2009

By: 

Kari P. Footland
Registration No. 55,187

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501